



Knowledge Organiser: Year 13

Psychology; RELATIONSHIPS

EVOLUTIONARY EXPLANATIONS FOR PARTNER PREFERENCES

1

SEXUAL SELECTION:

The selection of characteristics that aid successful reproduction, rather than survival.

Anisogamy– the difference between male and female sex cells .Sperm are small and produced in high numbers, so men can mate with unlimited partners, eggs require more energy to produce and are limited so women are choosier.

Intersexual selection– between sexes.

Preferred by females. Quality over quantity

Intrasexual selection– competition within a sex for mates. Preferred by males– quantity over quality.

EVALUATION

- Clark and Hatfield– would you go to bed with me tonight? 0 females said yes, 75% males said yes
- Buss– survey 10,000 Ps, 33 countries– consistent partner preferences.
- Temporal validity
- Does not explain homosexuality

FACTORS AFFECTING ATTRACTION- SELF-DISCLOSURE:

Self-disclosure– revealing personal information about yourself.

2

Social penetration theory– gradually revealing more personal detail about yourself to your partner. The rate at which social penetration occurs needs to match with your partner to be attracted to each other.

Breadth vs depth– breadth of superficial information at the start of a relationship, deeper information further into a relationship.

Reciprocity– Reis and Shaver 1988– self-disclosure needs to be reciprocal to build intimacy and trust.

EVALUATION

- Sprecher and Hendrick (2004)- correlations between self-disclosure and satisfaction for both men and women in heterosexual relationships– HOWEVER– correlational only
- Haas and Stafford 1998– 57% homosexual men and women said open self-disclosure needed to maintain relationship
- Applications– couples who work on self-disclosure might be able to fix relationship issues
- Cultural differences– Nu Tang et al (2013)- USA more sexual self-disclosure, China lower self-disclosure but equal level of satisfaction

FACTORS AFFECTING ATTRACTION- PHYSICAL ATTRACTIVENESS:

3

- Shackelford and Larsen– facial symmetry = genetic fitness
- Dion et al 1972- Halo effect– attractive people deemed to have other positive traits. Self-fulfilling prophecy
- Walster and Walster 1969– matching hypothesis. Look for partners that match our attractiveness level.

EVALUATION

- Palmer and Peterson 2012– physically attractive people rated as more politically knowledgeable, even when it was known they had no expertise
- Cunningham et al 1995– what is deemed attractive is very consistent across cultures (white, Hispanic and Asian males)
- Complex matching– partners might not just be matched on physical attractiveness, but the other things they offer a relationship
- Taylor et al 2011– online daters sought dates with people more physically attractive than them, not matched.

FACTORS AFFECTING ATTRACTION- FILTER THEORY: A01

4A

- Field of availables– total set of potential romantic partners– all the people we could possibly have a relationship with
- Field of desirables– of those available, all the people we find attractive or desirable. 3 levels of filter: social demography, similarity in attitudes, complementarity
- Social demography– proximity, social class, education, work, religion etc. Tend to pick the same or similar to us
- Similarity in attitude– sharing important beliefs and values. Seen as more important at the start of a relationship
- Complementarity– opposites attract later in a relationship

Leave blank to allow students to glue.



Knowledge Organiser: Year 13 Psychology; RELATIONSHIPS

FACTORS AFFECTING ATTRACTION- FILTER THEORY: A03

4B

- Kerckhoff and Davis– longitudinal study for relationships 18 months complementarity more important later on.
- Markey and Markey– complementarity not needed in lesbian relationships
- Actual similarity vs perceived similarity Montoya et al 2008
- Temporal validity– role of filters has changed over time

MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIP: SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

5

- Thibault and Kelley’s economic theory. People want a net profit (rewards must exceed costs) in order to maintain relationship. Rewards are different for everyone, might include companionship, sex, support, money etc.
- Comparison level (CL)- the amount of reward you believe you should get, based on experience of previous relationships and social norms. In order to main. If current relationship more rewarding, you will stay in it
- Comparison for alternatives (CLalt)- If the alternative of another relationship, or being by yourself would give more rewards compared to cost, you will leave.
- Stages of relationship development– sampling, bargaining, commitment, institutionalisation

EVALUATION

- Sprecher 2001– CLalt levels strong predictor of commitment in a relationship
- Majority of research based on studying strangers– lacks mundane realism
- Real life applications– IBCT
- Clark and Mills 2011– tally of rewards unlikely in a romantic relationship
- Determinism and Reductionism

MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIP: EQUITY THEORY

6

- Another economic theory but focuses on equity– fairness. Partners’ levels of profit should be roughly the same. A partner that has more costs should have more rewards as a result and vice versa.
- Lack of equity= 1 partner over-benefits, 1 under-benefits and both feel dissatisfied. “Over-benefitters” feel guilty, “under-benefitters” feel resentful
- The longer there is inequity, the more likely the relationship will end.
- Perceived equity might change over time. At the start partners might be happy to put in more than they get out, but this can lead to resentment long term.

EVALUATION

- Utne et al 1984– 118 recently married couples– those who perceived equity in the relationship were more satisfied.
- Stafford and Canary 2006– equity correlated with satisfaction, those who underbenefitted were least satisfied.
- Berg and McQuinn 1986– no increase in equity over time
- Cultural differences– those who overbenefit most happy in collectivist culture
- Gender- beta bias

MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIP: RUSBULT’S INVESTMENT MODEL

7A

- Development of social exchange theory– satisfaction and comparison with alternatives.
- Satisfaction– based on comparison level– if rewards and costs result with a profit, partners will remain in a relationship
- Comparison with alternatives (CLalt)– if another relationship or being by yourself will result in a higher profit, you will leave the relationship
- Investment– The more someone has invested, the more likely they are to maintain a relationship. Investment can be anything we would lose if the relationship were to end. Intrinsic– anything we put directly into the relationship. Extrinsic– resources that did not feature in the relationship, but are an indirect result and you would stand to lose if the relationship ended e.g. children, mutual friends
- Investment is seen as the most important factor for long term relationships. Can explain why dissatisfied partners might stay in a relationship.

Leave blank to allow students to glue.



Knowledge Organiser: Year 13 Psychology; RELATIONSHIPS

MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIP: RUSBULT’S INVESTMENT MODEL A03

7B

- Le and Agnew (2003)- reviewed 52 studies with 11,000 participants. Satisfaction, comparison with alternatives and investment size all predicted commitment. True across cultures, homosexual and heterosexual relationships.
- Most research relies on self-report. SDB
- Only correlation, no cause and effect
- Can explain why people stay in domestic abuse relationships, even when they are clearly dissatisfied and the CLalt is low
- Does not explain the earlier stages of a relationship, when investment is still small but people stay in relationships
- Goodfriend and Agnew– investment model is too simplistic. Future investments should be considered too

BREAKDOWN OF RELATIONSHIPS: DUCK’S PHASE MODEL

- Breakdown of a relationship is a process that takes time and goes through 4 phases. Each phase is marked by partners reaching a ‘threshold’.
1. Intra-psycho phase - cognitive processes within the individual where they think about their dissatisfaction. Threshold: I can’t stand this anymore
 2. Dyadic phase– partners start to confront each other and air their dissatisfaction. Threshold: I would be justified in leaving
 3. Social phase– Break up is made public. Partners seek support. Others will place blame on partner Usually point of not return. Threshold: I mean it.
 4. Grave dressing phase– Aftermath of break up. Each partner comes up with their own story to explain the relationship and save face. Threshold: it is now inevitable
 5. Resurrection phase– added in 2006. This is where each individual comes out the other side better for it, and use what they have learned to new relationships

EVALUATION

- Retrospective data
- Low cultural validity
- Does not really explain why, more a description of breakdown, so limited application

VIRTUAL RELATIONSHIPS

8

- Reduced cues theory– Sproull and Kiesler (1986)– virtual relationships less effective because they lack many cues we normally depend on
- Self-disclosure is reduced because people are more shy. Other people might experience de-individuation and feel freer to be blunt or even aggressive, reducing trust from the other partner. Ruppel et al 2017– self-disclosure greater in FtF relationships
- Hyperpersonal model– Walther (1996, 2011)- virtual relationships can involve greater self-disclosure because they develop quicker, but can also fizzle out quicker.
- Selective self-presentation– people have greater control over what to disclose, so can manipulate their self-image.
- Absence of gating– a gate is any obstacle to forming a relationship. Virtual relationships don’t have the obstacles of physical unattractiveness, social anxiety etc. Can be beneficial as people feel freer to be themselves, but also can allow people to be manipulative or deceitful.

EVALUATION

- Whitty and Joinson 2009– online discussions more direct than FtF
- Baker and Oswald 2010– online relationships helps shy people, so can help with FtF relationships too
- Virtual relationships are multimodal, not just online

Leave blank to allow students to glue.



Knowledge Organiser: Year 13 Psychology; RELATIONSHIPS

PARA-SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

- Maltby et al (2006). One-sided, unreciprocated relationships with a celebrity, significant figure or fictional character. Most likely if individual has deficiencies in their life. 3 levels of celebrity worship
- Entertainment-social– least intense, celebs seen as source of entertainment and fuel for social interaction.
- Intense-personal– greater personal involvement, obsessive thoughts and intensive feelings
- Borderline-pathological– uncontrollable fantasies and extreme behaviours. Spending large amounts of time or money. Reckless, dangerous or illegal acts to maintain relationship
- Absorption-addiction model: Absorption– relationship is something to focus on other than deficiencies in life. Addiction– need to increase their intensity of relationship in order to keep getting fulfilment from it.
- People who had insecure-resistant attachments in childhood most likely to form parasocial relationships as adults

9

EVALUATION

- McCutcheon et al 2006– categories were predictive of behaviour Largely correlational
- Studies rely on self-report
- Dinkha et al 2015– consistent findings across cultures

Leave blank to allow students to glue.



How do we use Knowledge Organisers in Psychology

How can you use knowledge organisers at home to help us?

- **Retrieval Practice:** Read over a section of the knowledge organiser, cover it up and then write down everything you can remember. Repeat until you remember everything.
- **Flash Cards:** Using the Knowledge Organisers to help on one side of a piece of paper write a question, on the other side write an answer. Ask someone to test you by asking a question and seeing if you know the answer.
- **Mind Maps:** Turn the information from the knowledge organiser into a mind map. Then reread the mind map and on a piece of paper half the size try and recreate the key phrases of the mind map from memory.
- **Sketch it:** Draw an image to represent each fact; this can be done in isolation or as part of the mind map/flash card.
- **Teach it:** Teach someone the information on your knowledge organiser, let them ask you questions and see if you know the answers.

How will we use knowledge organisers in Psychology?

- **Test:** We will do regular low stakes tests to check your ability to retrieve information from memory.
- **Mark our answers:** Once you have done a low stake test you can mark your work using the knowledge organiser.
- **Improve our work:** Once you have finished a piece of work you may be asked to check your knowledge organiser to see if there is any information on it that you could add into an answer.

<u>ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>SECTION ON KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
Learning Check point 1			/10
16 marker exam question			/16
MID UNIT			/20
Learning Check point 3			/10
END OF UNIT			/40